

Decision \_\_\_\_\_

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF  
CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company to Revise its Electric Marginal Costs, Revenue Allocation and Rate Design. (U39M)	Application 16-06-013 (Filed June 30, 2016)
---	--

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO AGRICULTURAL ENERGY  
CONSUMERS ASSOCIATION FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO  
DECISION (D.) 18-08-013**

<b>Intervenor: Agricultural Energy Consumers Association</b>	<b>For contribution to Decision (D.) 18-08-013</b>
<b>Claimed: \$ 137,388.48</b>	<b>Awarded: \$ 138,876.80</b>
<b>Assigned Commissioner: Marybel Batjer</b>	<b>Assigned ALJs: Michelle Cooke and Patrick Doherty</b>

**PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES**

<b>A. Brief description of Decision:</b>	D. 18-08-013 resolves the application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) to revise its electric marginal cost allocations and retail rate designs for its various customer classes, and other related issues. The Decision accepts settlements among the parties to the proceeding that made significant changes to PG&E's rate designs, including time of use (TOU) period changes.
--	--

**B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812<sup>1</sup>:**

	<b>Intervenor</b>	<b>CPUC Verification</b>
<b>Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):</b>		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	September 12, 2016	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:		
3. Date NOI filed:	October 11, 2016	Verified
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes

<sup>1</sup> All statutory references are to California Public Utilities Code unless indicated otherwise.

<b>Showing of eligible customer status (§ 1802(b) or eligible local government entity status (§§ 1802(d), 1802.4):</b>		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.17-06-015	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	December 4, 2017	Verified
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		N/A
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer status or eligible government entity status?		Yes
<b>Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§1802(h) or §1803.1(b)):</b>		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.17-06-015	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	December 4, 2017	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		N/A
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
<b>Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):</b>		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D. 18-08-013	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	August 17, 2018	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	October 16, 2018	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

**C. Additional Comments on Part I:**

#	Intervenor’s Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
	In multiple decisions over the past two decades ( <i>see, e.g.</i> , D.95-07-093; D.96-08-040; D.96-11-048; D.02-06-014; D.03-09-067; D.06-04-065; D.13-02-019; D.13-02-019; D.14-12-069; D.15-12-014) and most recently in D.16-08-013, the Commission has found that AECA represents individual farmers who have annual electricity bills of less than \$50,000, and that members’ economic interest has been considered small in	Noted

	<p>comparison to the costs of participation. Pursuant to the additional guidance provided by the ALJ in the December 4, 2017 Ruling issued in R.17-06-015 on AECA's Showing of Significant Financial Hardship, AECA provides information on the percentage of AECA membership who are agricultural customers with annual electric bills below \$50,000. For purposes of this proceeding, AECA currently has 280 active individual members (excluding agricultural associations and water district members); 178 of those members have electricity bills of less than \$50,000. As a result, AECA is seeking 64% (<math>178 \div 280</math>) of the total compensation found reasonable in this proceeding.</p>	
--	--	--

## PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION

### A. Did the Intervenor substantially contribute to the final decision (*see* § 1802(j), § 1803(a), 1803.1(a) and D.98-04-059)

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>1. AECA was an active party in the proceeding and settlement discussions, including participating, by invitation from PG&amp;E, in numerous pre-application filing discussions with PG&amp;E about its proposals for ag rates in this proceeding, filing a protest, submitting testimony, signing onto the Marginal Cost and Revenue Allocation Settlement, the Agricultural rates settlement, and the Ag TOU settlement, participating in evidentiary hearings and</p>		Verified

<p>filing opening and reply briefs on litigated issues, and filing comments on the proposed decision.</p> <p>“Protests to PG&amp;E’s application were filed...jointly by...Agricultural Energy Consumers Association (AECA) and California Farm Bureau Federation (CFBF)....”</p> <p>“On March 15, 2017, the following parties served their prepared testimony: AECA....”</p> <p>“A settlement amongst the parties on marginal cost and revenue allocation issues (MC/RA settlement) was served on October 26, 2017. The settling parties were AECA....”</p> <p>“On March 30, 2018, PG&amp;E served a motion to adopt a supplemental settlement agreement on agricultural rate design issues (Ag rates settlement). The parties to the Ag rates settlement are PG&amp;E, CFBF, and AECA.”</p> <p>“On March 28, 2018, PG&amp;E served a motion to adopt supplemental settlement agreement on TOU rates for legacy solar agricultural customers (Ag TOU settlement). The parties to this supplemental settlement are PG&amp;E, CALSSA, AECA and</p>	<p>D.18-08-013, p. 3.</p> <p>D.18-08-013, p. 5.</p> <p>D.18-08-013, p. 21; MC/RA settlement, Sec. II.</p> <p>D.18-08-013, p. 87; Ag rates settlement, Sec. II.</p> <p>D.18-08-013, p. 89; Ag TOU settlement, Sec. II.</p>	<p>Verified</p> <p>Verified</p> <p>Verified</p> <p>Verified</p>
---	---	---

CFBF.		
2. AECA supported PG&E's proposed revenue allocation and actively sought to mitigate the impacts of significant increases proposed by other parties.		Verified
"AECA strongly supports the utility's proposed revenue allocation..."	Exh. AECA-1, pp. 2-4.	Verified
PG&E proposed a .41% increase for the Agricultural Class	Exh. PGE-1, Vol. 1, p.1-12, Table 1-1.	Verified
The Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) proposed a 3% increase for the Agricultural Class.	Exh. ORA-1, p. 10-5, Table 10-3.	Verified
The California Large Energy Consumers Association (CLECA) proposed a 17.7% increase for the Agricultural Class.	Exh. CLECA-1, p. 98, Table 8A.	Verified
The Energy Producers and Users Coalition (EPUC) proposed a 4% increase for the Agricultural Class	Exh. EPUC-1, p. 33, Table 7.	Verified
<u>Settlement:</u> Parties agreed to a 0.70% increase for the Agricultural Class in the marginal cost and revenue allocation settlement	Settlement Agreement on Marginal Cost and Revenue Allocation, p.7	

<p>agreement.</p> <p><u>Decision:</u></p> <p>“We therefore find that PG&amp;E’s revenue allocation proposals, as modified by the MC/RA settlement, are reasonable and should be adopted.”</p>	<p>D.18-08-013, p. 27.</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>3. AECA, in a joint Protest with CFBF, its testimony, and in joint testimony with CFBF (Ag Parties), asserted that PG&amp;E’s forecasting is deeply flawed, and changes should be made to take better account for actual hydrologic conditions.</p> <p><u>Settlement:</u></p> <p>“PG&amp;E agrees that adopted agricultural sales forecasts can vary (and have varied) significantly from actual sales. .... [T]he Parties have agreed that some data tracking should be performed, which can then be considered in the 2020 GRC Phase II proceeding.”</p> <p><u>Decision:</u></p> <p>“It appears that PG&amp;E and the Agricultural Parties agree that actual electricity sales for the</p>	<p>Protest of the California Farm Bureau Federation and the Agricultural Energy Consumers Association to the General Rate Case Phase II Application of PG&amp;E, pp. 2-3; Exh. AECA-1, pp. 18-22; Exh. Ag Parties-1, in its entirety; Opening Brief of CFBF and AECA on Agricultural Class Variability, in its entirety; Reply Brief of CFBF and AECA to PG&amp;E’s Opening Brief on Agricultural Class Variability, in its entirety.</p> <p>MC/RA settlement, Attachment 2, p.1.</p> <p>D.18-08-013, p. 149.</p>	<p>Verified</p> <p>Verified</p>

<p>agricultural class deviate substantially from forecasted sales for the class on a regular basis, and that the deviation is driving by the availability of surface water for irrigation. This suggests that the forecasting mechanism for the agricultural class is flawed and should be refined that such forecasts are more accurate.”</p> <p>While the Commission stated that establishing a specific methodology for forecasting agricultural sales is better suited for litigation in PG&amp;E’s ERRA proceeding, it found that “the sales forecasting mechanism for the agricultural class is flawed and should be refined such that forecasts are more accurate. We therefore order PG&amp;E to propose an improved sales forecasting mechanism for the agricultural class in its next ERRA proceeding, and to involve the Agricultural Parties in the development of that improved mechanism.”</p>	<p>D.18-08-013, p. 150.</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>4. AECA proposed that agricultural customers be offered a wider array of pricing options (<i>i.e.</i>, rate schedules).</p> <p>“PG&amp;E proposes to collapse 13 tariffs to three, and eliminate flat-rate options. While rate consolidation might make PG&amp;E’s life easier, with less complicated billing, it</p>	<p>Exh. AECA-1, pp. 25-30.</p> <p>Exh. AECA-1, p. 25.</p>	<p>Verified</p> <p>Verified</p>

offers little to agriculture.”		
“Growers reasonably want to be able to recoup the long-term outlays they have made to shift load from previously-identified high cost periods, as requested by the Commission and the utilities, to the benefit of all ratepayers.”	Exh. AECA-1, p. 29.	Verified
“The CPUC should allow agricultural customers who have shifted their loads away from existing peak periods to stay on rate schedules that reflect the same periods and cost differentials for up to 10 years, thereby enabling them to recoup their investments over a sufficient time period.”	D.18-08-013, p. 26.	Verified
<u>Settlement:</u>		
“Schedules AG-1, AG-4, AG-5, AG-R and AG-V will be retained as legacy rate schedules with their current time of use (TOU) periods until rates with new TOU periods adopted in this proceeding become mandatory....”	Ag rates settlement, Sec. V.B.	
“The mandatory transition to rates with new TOU periods...shall be no earlier than the start of the customer’s March 2021 billing cycle.”	Ag rates settlement, Sec. V.C.	
“Ag Settling Parties further agree that mitigation measures	Ag rates settlement, Sec. V.C.	



<p>for those bundled customers potentially most impacted by implementation of mandatory TOU (sic) with new TOU periods will be considered in PG&amp;E’s 2019 Rate Design Window (RDW) proceeding.”</p> <p><u>Decision:</u></p> <p>“[T]he Ag rates settlement should be approved for reasons including the following: ...It significantly simplifies the rate schedules applicable to agricultural customers ...; It delays implementation of the new TOU periods to March 2020 and 2021” and it provides for development of mitigation measures for those agricultural customers most affected by the new TOU rates... .”</p>	<p>D.18-08-013, pp. 87-88.</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>5. AECA explained that “[h]aving to wait until 10:00 p.m. to turn on irrigation systems means that growers’ labor crews would have to work in the dark under possibly hazardous conditions to comply with the new pricing periods, creating safety hazards.”</p> <p><u>Settlement:</u></p> <p>“The AG Settling Parties agree that the seasons and time of use periods for Schedules AG-A, AG-B and AG-C set forth in Appendix A are: Summer: June-September (4 months); Winter: October through May</p>	<p>Exh. AECA-1, pp. 29-30.</p> <p>Ag rates settlement, Sec. V.D.</p>	<p>Verified</p>

<p>(8 months); Peak Period: 5:00 pm to -8:00 pm, all days of the year; Off Peak Period: All remaining hours.”</p> <p><u>Decision:</u></p> <p>“Therefore, particular operational needs of agricultural customers justify an earlier end to the peak period than for non-agricultural customers.”</p>	<p>D.18-08-013, pp. 35-36.</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>6. PG&amp;E proposed “to limit the [AG-R] rate to two consecutive weekdays, completely avoiding the weekend, which many growers now take advantage of.” AECA advocated that “[r]ather than restrict customer choice, PG&amp;E could diversify its local peak loads by offering a full range of off-peak day combinations on a subscription basis within a circuit or substation service area.”</p> <p><u>Settlement:</u></p> <p>“The AG Settling Parties agree that a new AG-R should be adopted that would provide similar pumping flexibility and long off-peak pumping periods.”</p> <p><u>Decision:</u></p> <p>“The Ag rates settlement</p>	<p>Exh. AECA-1, pp. 31-32.</p> <p>Ag rates settlement, Sec. V.G.(1).</p> <p>D.18-08-013, p. 88.</p>	<p>Verified</p> <p>Verified</p>

includes a rate option for agricultural customers that allows for two days per week for off-peak usage to accord with agricultural operational needs.”		
<p>7. The customer charge should not be radically altered: “The utility wants to raise agricultural customer charges by 20 percent... . Instead, the utility should leave the customer charge as it is.”</p> <p><u>Settlement:</u></p> <p>“The AG Settling Parties agree that customer charges will remain at their current levels on the legacy rate schedules. ... These customer charges will remain in place until implementation of PG&amp;E’s 2020 GRC Phase II rates.”</p>	<p>Exh. AECA-1, pp. 32-33.</p> <p>Ag rates settlement, Sec. V.E.</p>	Verified
<p>8. “PG&amp;E wants to...transition agricultural energy and demand charges toward ‘full cost levels,’ subject to setting seasonal and TOU price differentials based on marginal costs.</p> <p>“PG&amp;E’s basis for estimating marginal cost is seriously undermined by errors and misconceptions. The utility has rightfully chosen to avoid reallocating revenue responsibility among rate classes in this application. PG&amp;E should likewise desist</p>	Exh. AECA-1, pp. 32-33.	Verified

<p>from attempting to redesign rate elements to achieve faux cost responsibility.”</p> <p><u>Settlement:</u></p> <p>“The AG Settling Parties agree to apply a demand charge limiter (DCL) to customers served under Schedule AG-C.”</p> <p>“Demand charges for AG-A and legacy rate schedules... will be converted to billing on metered demand at the same time rates with new TOU periods are offered on an opt-in basis.”</p>	<p>Ag rates settlement, Sec. V.G.(2).</p> <p>Ag rates settlement, Sec. V.G.(4).</p>	
<p>9. “Monthly billing cycles are purely arbitrary measures that have nothing to do with resource planning or acquisition, particularly in a world in which SmartMeters can record demand in 15-minute increments. Monthly billing periods are an artifact of administrative convenience and reliance on ‘dumb’ meters, and bear no relationship to actual cost causation”</p> <p><u>Settlement:</u></p> <p>“Optimal Billing Period Program: This program will be retained for customers served on legacy Schedule AG-5C, and new Schedule AG-C.”</p>	<p>Exh. AECA-1, p. 33.</p> <p>Ag rates settlement, Sec. V.G.(3).</p>	<p>Verified</p>

<p>10. AECA participated in settlement discussions intended to resolve litigation positions relating to the rate design for grandfathered TOU periods for agricultural solar customers.</p> <p>“The CPUC should allow agricultural customers who have shifted their loads away from existing peak periods to stay on rate schedules that reflect the same periods and cost differentials for up to 10 years, thereby enabling them to recoup their investments over a sufficient time period.”</p> <p><u>Settlement:</u></p> <p>“To provide for a gradual transition to flatter time of use relationships, the Settling Parties agree to a transition plan to gradually lower the generation and distribution rate differentials between peak, partial-peak and off-peak periods including gradual reductions to the summer peak demand charges.”</p> <p><u>Decision:</u></p> <p>“The TOU settlement and Ag TOU settlement (TOU settlements) seek to apply the requirements of D.17-01-006, which set out guidelines for how to apply changes in TOU peak periods to utility customers with existing customer-sited renewable generation systems. ... The</p>	<p>Ag TOU Settlement, Sec. I.</p> <p>Exh. AECA-1, pp. 25-30.</p> <p>Ag TOU Settlement, Sec. C.</p> <p>D.18-08-013, pp. 89-90.</p>	<p>Verified</p> <p>Verified</p>
---	---	---------------------------------

TOU settlements generally seek to levelize the peak to part-peak prices as experienced by legacy TOU customers, in compliance with the principles of D.17-01-006.”		
--	--	--

**B. Duplication of Effort (§ 1801.3(f) and § 1802.5):**

	<b>Intervenor’s Assertion</b>	<b>CPUC Discussion</b>
<b>a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) a party to the proceeding?</b>	Yes	Yes
<b>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?</b>	Yes	Yes
<b>c. If so, provide name of other parties:</b> California Farm Bureau Federation (CFBF)		Verified
<b>d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication:</b> AECA and CFBF have historically submitted separate testimony in CPUC proceedings, raising distinct, non-duplicative issues. In this proceeding, AECA and CFBF provided separate testimony, consistent with this usual practice.  Additionally, to avoid duplication, ACEA and CFBF submitted joint testimony on an issue important to both parties, agricultural sales forecast variability. Further, during settlement negotiations the two agricultural groups coordinated efforts. While both parties seek reasonable outcomes for agricultural customers, AECA highlighted the flawed underlying cost modeling used to justify TOU rate structures, sought grandfathered TOU periods, and offered other options to help minimize the impact on agricultural customers. AECA’s involvement led directly to the		Verified

<p>agreements outlined in the various settlement agreements.</p> <p>AECA's active participation and expertise in Agricultural Rate Design issues directly led to reduced adverse impacts on the agricultural class and more appropriate considerations for the unique characteristics of agricultural energy use.</p> <p>AECA's efforts to avoid duplication with other parties, evidenced by its coordination with CFBF, and dedicated pursuit of important issues should be recognized by the Commission.</p>	
---	--

### **PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION**

#### **A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§ 1801 and § 1806):**

	<b>CPUC Discussion</b>
<p><b>a. Intervenor's claim of cost reasonableness:</b></p> <p>AECA's requests an intervenor compensation award of \$ 137,388.48 (\$214,669.50 x .64). The requested award is reasonable in light of the benefits, summarized above, achieved through AECA's participation in the proceeding. AECA's participation in pre-application filing discussions, at PG&amp;E's request, helped lay the groundwork for the settlement agreements</p>	Noted

<p>that were ultimately agreed upon. AECA's efforts to secure rate design elements unique to the Agricultural and Pumping Class will help farmers adjust to new TOU rates while minimizing bill impacts to customers. Additionally, the requirement for PG&amp;E to address flawed sales forecasting is a major step forward for the agricultural class. Finally, AECA diligently worked to avoid duplication of effort with other parties.</p>	
<p><b>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</b></p> <p>AECA's request is reasonable in light of the scope of the proceeding and the length and complexity of negotiations. AECA's requested amount slightly above its NOI estimate of about \$199,700. This amount reflects AECA's efforts to effectively manage participation costs. AECA is not seeking travel or other costs of participation. In addition, AECA relied on well-priced economic experts to conduct research, review data responses and conduct bill impact analysis and rate design scenarios, thereby minimizing attorney fees and further keeping costs in check. Even so, consultant costs were impacted due to a need to review several iterations of corrections to PG&amp;E modeling data, and attorney fees were impacted because the agricultural sales forecasting variability issue was resolved through hearings and briefing, following settlement discussions. Additionally, the magnitude of changes PG&amp;E presented to the Agricultural Class required significant review and discussion. The discussions leading up to the Settlements were complex and lengthy given the magnitude and complexity of the issues under discussion.</p>	<p>The hours claimed are reasonable considering AECA's contribution during this Proceeding.</p>



<p>AECA submitted comprehensive testimony documenting the unique intricacies associated with PG&amp;E’s proposals for Agricultural and Pumping customers. The ultimate agreements recognized exactly what AECA demonstrated in testimony – that agricultural operations should receive separate consideration because of the complicated nature of agricultural energy use.</p> <p>AECA submits that documented hours claimed are reasonable, both for each attorney and expert individually, and in the aggregate, and AECA respectfully asks that this request be granted.</p>															
<p><b>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</b> Hours are allocated by issue as follows (see Excel spreadsheet for further detail:</p> <table> <tr> <td>General Policy:</td><td>1%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Marginal Cost Methods:</td><td>8%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Revenue Allocation:</td><td>19%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Rate Design:</td><td>30%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Ag Sales Forecast Variability (Balancing Account):</td><td>24%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Time of Use:</td><td>18%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Total:</td><td>100%</td></tr> </table>	General Policy:	1%	Marginal Cost Methods:	8%	Revenue Allocation:	19%	Rate Design:	30%	Ag Sales Forecast Variability (Balancing Account):	24%	Time of Use:	18%	Total:	100%	Noted
General Policy:	1%														
Marginal Cost Methods:	8%														
Revenue Allocation:	19%														
Rate Design:	30%														
Ag Sales Forecast Variability (Balancing Account):	24%														
Time of Use:	18%														
Total:	100%														

**B. Specific Claim:\***

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Ann L. Trowbridge	2016	8.4	\$400.00	D.16-18-013, ALJ-345 and ALJ-352	\$3,360.00	8.4	\$410.00 (1)	\$3,444.00
Ann L. Trowbridge	2017	9.3	\$415.00	D.16-18-013, ALJ-345 and ALJ-352	\$3,859.50	9.3	\$420.00 (2)	\$3,906.00
Ann L. Trowbridge	2018	47.5	\$415.00	D.16-18-013, ALJ-345 and ALJ-352	\$19,712.50	47.5	\$430.00 (3)	\$20,425.00
Richard McCann	2016	48.5	\$210.00	D.16-18-013, ALJ-345 and ALJ-352	\$10,185.00	48.5	\$215.00 (4)	\$10,427.50
Richard McCann	2017	177.75	\$215.00	D.16-18-013, ALJ-345 and ALJ-352	\$38,216.25	177.75	\$215.00	\$38,162.50
Richard McCann	2018	46	\$215.00	D.16-18-013, ALJ-345 and ALJ-352	\$9,890.00	46	\$215.00	\$9,890.00
Steven Moss	2016	37.25	\$215.00	D.16-18-013, ALJ-345 and ALJ-352	\$8,008.75	37.25	\$215.00	\$8,008.75
Steven Moss	2017	111.75	\$215.00	D.16-18-013, ALJ-345 and ALJ-352	\$24,026.25	111.75	\$215.00	\$24,026.25

Steven Moss	2018	28.5	\$215.00	D.16-18-013, ALJ-345 and ALJ-352	\$6,127.50	28.5	\$215.00	\$6,127.50
Elizabeth Stryjewski	2016	31.5	\$85.00	D.16-18-013, ALJ-345 and ALJ-352	\$2,677.50	31.5	\$85.00 (5)	\$2,677.50
Elizabeth Stryjewski	2017	187.25	\$85.00	D.16-18-013, ALJ-345 and ALJ-352	\$15,916.25	187.25	\$85.00	\$15,916.25
Elizabeth Stryjewski	2018	12.25	\$85.00	D.16-18-013, ALJ-345 and ALJ-352	\$1,041.25	12.25	\$85.00	\$1,041.25
Michael Boccadoro	2016	33	\$210.00	D.16-18-013, ALJ-345 and ALJ-352	\$6,930.00	33	\$215.00 (6)	\$7,095.00
Michael Boccadoro	2017	118.25	\$215.00	D.16-18-013, ALJ-345 and ALJ-352	\$25,423.75	118.25	\$220.00 (7)	\$26,015.00
Michael Boccadoro	2018	40.5	\$215.00	D.16-18-013, ALJ-345 and ALJ-352	\$8,707.50	40.5	\$225.00 (8)	\$9,112.50
Beth Olhasso	2016	29	\$155.00	D.16-18-013, ALJ-345 and ALJ-352	\$4,495.00	29	\$155.00	\$4,495.00
Beth Olhasso	2017	116.25	\$155.00	D.16-18-013, ALJ-345 and ALJ-352	\$18,018.75	116.25	\$155.00	\$18,018.75
Beth Olhasso	2018	31.5	\$155.00	D.16-18-013, ALJ-345 and ALJ-352	\$4,882.50	31.5	\$155.00	\$4,882.50
<b>Subtotal: \$211,478.25</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$213,671.25</b>		

INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Michael Boccadoro	2016	2	\$105.00	D.16-18-013, ALJ-345 and ALJ-352	\$210.00	2	\$107.50	\$215.00
Michael Boccadoro	2018	3.5	\$107.50	D.16-18-013, ALJ-345 and ALJ-352	\$376.25	3.5	\$112.50	\$393.75
Beth Olhasso	2016	5	\$77.50	D.16-18-013, ALJ-345 and ALJ-352	\$387.50	5	\$77.50	\$387.50
Beth Olhasso	2018	11	\$77.50	D.16-18-013, ALJ-345 and ALJ-352	\$852.50	11	\$77.50	\$907.50
Ann Trowbridge	2016	.6	\$200.00	D.16-18-013, ALJ-345 and ALJ-352	\$120.00	0.6	\$205.00	\$130.00
Ann Trowbridge	2018	6	\$207.50	D.16-18-013, ALJ-345 and ALJ-352	\$1,245.00	6	\$215.00	\$1,290.00
Subtotal: \$3,191.25						Subtotal: \$3,323.75		
TOTAL COST OF PARTICIPATION: \$214,669.50						TOTAL REASONABLE COSTS: 64% of \$216,995.00 (9)		
<p>*We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit the records and books of the intervenors to the extent necessary to verify the basis for the award (§1804(d)). Intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenor’s records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.</p> <p>**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time are typically compensated at ½ of preparer’s normal hourly rate.</p>								

<b>ATTORNEY INFORMATION</b>			
<b>Attorney</b>	<b>Date Admitted to CA BAR<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Member Number</b>	<b>Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If “Yes”, attach explanation</b>
Ann L. Trowbridge	December 1993	169591	No

**C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III:**

<b>Attachment or Comment #</b>	<b>Description/Comment</b>
1	<b>Certificate of Service</b>
2	<b>List of Relevant AECA Submittals in A.16-06-013</b>
3	<b>Staff time records</b>
Comment 1	<b>AECA is not claiming any costs in this request. AECA has used electronic mail communication, phone and conference calls to reduce filing and meeting costs and keep overall costs to a minimum, further demonstrating the reasonableness of this claim.</b>
Comment 2	<b>Rationale for Ann Trowbridge’s hourly rate: AECA is requesting an hourly rate of \$400 in 2016, and \$415 in 2017 and 2018 for Ms. Trowbridge. Ms. Trowbridge last received \$405 for work performed in 2016 (D.16-08-013). Her rates for 2016, 2017 and 2018 places her at the low end of the range for attorneys with 13-plus years of relevant experience (see Res. ALJ-345 and ALJ-352). Ms. Trowbridge graduated from University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law in 1993, and has practiced extensively before the Commission since the late 1990’s.</b>
Comment 3	<b>Rationale for Richard McCann’s hourly rate: AECA is requesting an hourly rate of \$210 in 2016 and \$215 in 2017 and 2018 for Dr. McCann. He last received \$210 for work performed in 2016 (D.16-08-013). His rates for 2016, 2017 and 2018 put him at the low end of the range for experts with 13-plus years of experience. Dr. McCann has over 20 years of experience in energy consulting.</b>
Comment 4	<b>Rationale for Steven Moss’s hourly rate: AECA is requesting an hourly rate of \$215 in 2016, 2017 and 2018 for Mr. Moss. He last received \$215 for work performed in 2016 (D.16-08-013). His rates for 2016, 2017 and 2018 put him at the low end of the range for experts with 13-plus years of experience. Mr. Moss has over 20 years of experience in energy consulting.</b>
Comment 5	<b>Rationale for Elizabeth Stryjewski’s hourly rate: AECA is requesting an hourly rate of \$85 in 2016, 2017 and 2018 for Ms. Stryjewski. She last received \$75 for work performed in 2016 (D.16-08-013). Her rates for 2016, 2017 and 2018 put her below the low end of the range for experts with 6-plus years of experience. Ms. Stryjewski has over 6 years of experience in</b>

<sup>2</sup> This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California’s website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch>

	<b>energy consulting.</b>
Comment 6	<b>Rationale for Michael Boccadoro's hourly rate:</b> AECA is requesting an hourly rate of \$210 for in 2016 and \$215 in 2017 and 2018 for Mr. Boccadoro. He last received \$210 for work performed in 2016 (D.16-08-013). His rate of \$215 for 2017 and 2018 places him at the low end of the range for experts with 13-plus years of relevant experience (see Res. ALJ-345 and ALJ-352). He has over 20 years of experience as an energy policy and resource management expert.
Comment 7	<b>Rationale for Beth Olhasso's hourly rate:</b> AECA is requesting an hourly rate of \$155 for Ms. Olhasso in 2016, 2017, and 2018. She last received \$155 for work performed in 2016 (D.16-08-013). Her rate of \$155 for 2016, 2017 and 2018 places her at the low end of the range for experts with 0 to 6 years of relevant experience (see Res. ALJ-352). She has approximately 6 years of relevant experience.

#### D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments

Item	Reason
1	Ann L. Trowbridge's 2016 rate was established on D1618013 as \$410.00.
2	Ann L. Trowbridge's 2017 rate was adjusted to add the 2017 ALJ-345 COLA of 2.14% The new rate established for 2017 is \$420.00.
3	Ann L. Trowbridge's 2018 rate was adjusted to add the 2018 ALJ-352 COLA of 2.3% The new rate established for 2018 is \$430.00.
4	Richard McCann's 2016 rate was adjusted to add the 2016 ALJ-329 COLA of 1.28% The new rate established for 2016 is \$215.00.
5	Elizabeth Stryjewski's 2016 rate was adjusted to add the 2016 ALJ-329 COLA of 1.28% The new rate established for 2016 is \$85.00.
6	Michael Boccadoro's 2016 rate was adjusted to add the 2016 ALJ-329 COLA of 1.28% The new rate established for 2016 is \$215.00.
7	Michael Boccadoro's 2017 rate was adjusted to add the 2017 ALJ-345 COLA of 2.14% The new rate established for 2017 is \$220.00.

8	Micheal Boccadoro's 2018 rate was adjusted to add the 2018 ALJ-352 COLA of 2.3% The new rate established for 2018 is \$225.00.
9	AECA is seeking 64% of the total compensation found reasonable in this proceeding, to reflect the proportion of small commercial rate payers they represent. This decision grants 64% of the total expenses claimed by AECA.

#### **PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS**

**Within 30 days after service of this Claim, Commission Staff or any other party may file a response to the Claim (*see* § 1804(c))**

<b>A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?</b>	No
<b>B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (<i>see</i> Rule 14.6(c)(6))?</b>	Yes

#### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. Agricultural Energy Consumers Association has made a substantial contribution to D.18-08-013.
2. The requested hourly rates for Agricultural Energy Consumers Association's representatives, as adjusted herein, are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
3. The claimed costs and expenses, as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$138,876.80.

#### **CONCLUSION OF LAW**

1. The Claim, with any adjustment set forth above, satisfies all requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812.

#### **ORDER**

1. Agricultural Energy Consumers Association shall be awarded \$138,876.80.

2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company shall pay Agricultural Energy Consumers Association the total award. Payment of the award shall include compound interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month non-financial commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning December 30, 2018 the 75<sup>th</sup> day after the filing of Agricultural Energy Consumers Association's request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.
4. This decision is effective today.

Dated \_\_\_\_\_, at Los Angeles, California.



**APPENDIX****Compensation Decision Summary Information**

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision:	D1808013		
Proceeding:	A1606013		
Author:	ALJs Michelle Cooke and Patrick Doherty		
Payer:	Pacific Gas and Electric Company		

**Intervenor Information**

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Agricultural Energy Consumers Association	October 16, 2018	\$137,388.48	\$138,876.80	N/A	Cost of living adjustments.

**Hourly Fee Information**

First Name	Last Name	Attorney, Expert, or Advocate	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Ann L.	Trowbridge	Attorney	\$400.00	2016	\$410.00
Ann L.	Trowbridge	Attorney	\$415.00	2017	\$420.00
Ann L.	Trowbridge	Attorney	\$415.00	2018	\$430.00
Richard	McCann	Consultant	\$210.00	2016	\$215.00
Richard	McCann	Consultant	\$215.00	2017	\$215.00
Richard	McCann	Consultant	\$215.00	2018	\$215.00
Steven	Moss	Consultant	\$215.00	2016	\$215.00
Steven	Moss	Consultant	\$215.00	2017	\$215.00
Steven	Moss	Consultant	\$215.00	2018	\$215.00
Elizabeth	Stryjewski	Expert	\$85.00	2016	\$85.00
Elizabeth	Stryjewski	Expert	\$85.00	2017	\$85.00
Elizabeth	Stryjewski	Expert	\$85.00	2018	\$85.00
Michael	Boccadoro	Executive Director	\$210.00	2016	\$215.00
Michael	Boccadoro	Executive Director	\$215.00	2017	\$220.00
Michael	Boccadoro	Executive Director	\$215.00	2018	\$225.00
Beth	Olhasso	Assistant Executive Director	\$155.00	2016	\$155.00
Beth	Olhasso	Assistant Executive Director	\$155.00	2017	\$155.00
Beth	Olhasso	Assistant Executive Director	\$155.00	2018	\$155.00

**(END OF APPENDIX)**